DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 751 FL 003 031

AUTHOR Fishman, Joshua A.
TITLE Bilingual and Bidialectal Education: An Attempt at a Joint Model for Policy Description.
INSTITUTION Laval Univ., Quebec. International Center on Bilingualism.
PUB DATE Nov 71
NOTE 12p.; In "Conference on Child Language," preprints of papers presented at the Conference, Chicago, Illinois, November 22-24, 1971, p356-367

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Bilingualism; Diachronic Linguistics; *Dialects; *Educational Policy; *Language Planning; Language Programs; *Languages; Regional Dialects; Second Language Learning; Second Languages; Sociolinguistics

ABSTRACT

This paper questions whether the same theoretical model of educational policy decisions can be used for bilingual as well as bidialectal education. Three basic policies are discussed, first in applications for second language learning and then in the field of teaching a second dialect. Generally speaking, the same theoretical models are applicable to both educational problems with variation in administrative units between the two levels. (VM)

ED 060751

BILINGUAL AND BIDIALECTAL EDUCATION: AN ATTEMPT AT A JOINT MODEL FOR POLICY DESCRIPTION

Joshua A. Fishman
Yeshiva University *
New York

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A basic conceptual premise of modern sociology of language/sociolinguistics is that the functional diversification of the language repertoire of a speech community can be analyzed along essentially identical dimensions regardless of the societal view or the nature of the codes or varieties involved therein. Thus, whether it consists of several "languages", or whether it consists of several "dialects" or "sociolects", or whether it consists of both different "languages" and different "dialects/sociolects", the functional allocation of varieties within the community is felt to be describable in much the same way. Whether the analysis is in terms of situations and their counterparts or in terms of domains and their counterparts is related not to any distinction between "languages" on the one hand and "dialects" on the other, but, rather, at best, to the level of analysis required by the researcher for the particular problem under study, or, at worst, to the level indicated by the limits of his own professional indoctrination. In either case the distinction between "languages" and "dialects" is considered

FL 003 031

* Currently on leave as Co-Director of The International Research Project on Language Planning Processes, Coordinator of the Israeli Section thereof, and Visiting Professor at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. This paper was prepared for the "Conference on Child Language" (Chicago, Nov. 1971, Theodore Andersson, Chairman).

to be basically a within-community functional-evaluative distinction, rather than one that can be made on the basis of objective external criteria. Certainly a diachronic view amply supports this approach (revealing any number of once "mere" dialects, that were subsequently functionally, evaluatively and structurally "elevated" to the position of languages as well as many cases of the reverse progression), however much a synchronic view may reveal objective differences between coexisting languages and dialects with respect to such matters as extent of elaboration and codification.

Given the foregoing view that all varieties in a community's repertoire can be subjected to sociolinguistic analysis along identical dimenstions -- regardless of the functional-evaluative-structural differences that may characterize them -- this paper attempts to examine the further question as to whether a single integrative model is also possible with respect to educational policy description when such policy deals with separate languages on the one hand and with separate dialects on the other.

A model for bilingual policy description will be examined first, namely that derived from my paper on "National languages and languages of wider communication in the developing nations" (Fishman 1969). In its initial formulation the model proved to be useful to me and to some others (Kelman 1971, Whitely 1970) for the purpose of discussing national language policies in general.

On further examination, this model may hold forth some promise also for the purposes to be discussed here.

Type A policy formulations with respect to bilingual education transpire in those settings in which educational authorities feel compelled to select for educational use a language which is not a mother-tongue within the administrative unit of educational policy decision (a country, a region, a district, etc). This is done when none of the varieties natively available within such units is considered to be integratively school-worthy, i.e. to correspond to a great tradition of past, present and future integrative authenticity and integrative greatness. Under such circumstances an outside Language of Wider Communication is selected to fulfil most educational functions.

The immediate practical consequences of conducting a school-system in a language which is not the mother tongue of (the vast majority of) the students are many. The first consequence is that the Type A policy ~~system~~ itself must initially be set aside for the earliest period of education, no matter how brief this may be, so that at least a minimum of one-way communication (from pupils to teachers)is possible from the outset. A frequent further consequence is that teachers too must begin by using the MT of their pupils, or at least, by being receptively familiar with it and with some of its contrastive features vis-a-vis the LWC which they must implement. All in all, however, the bilingual education that results from Type A policy decisions is minimal and transitional. Even if this stage is recognized in teacher training or in the preparation of learning and teaching materials the goal is to leave bilingualism behind as soon as

possible in order to transfer all educational efforts to the selected external LWC. Several countries of West Africa (e.g. Gambia, Sierra Leone) have made national policy decisions of this type, as have Latin American countries with respect to the education of indigenous regional Indian populations, as have most host countries with respect to the education of locally settled immigrant groups, particularly those of low social standing.

Further consequences of Type A policy decisions re bilingual educations also inevitably flow from the adoption of an external LWC. Since the language adopted is a mother tongue elsewhere (outside of the administrative unit under consideration), it must be decided whether the curriculum and standards in effect "there" should also be implemented "here", or whether indigenously determined content, methods and standards are to be employed. Frequently the former view has prevailed at the outset and the latter view has been accepted only later and reluctantly. Finally the consequences for adult literacy of Type A policy decisions are clearly fargoing. Those beyond school age have even greater difficulty in achieving and retaining literacy in a foreign language than do those who are still of school age. Even the latter experience difficulty in both of these respects given the high drop out rates and the lack of post-school functional exposure to or reliance upon the school language which mark most settings in which Type A policy decisions are reached.

Do Type A policies (which,in effect, restrict bilingual education to thebarest minima consistent with transitional goals) have their counterparts in the area of bi-dialectal education? Obviously there are many similarities, particularly where social mobility is low and role repertoires are narrow. Under such circumstances dialects/ sociolects that are common in other parts of the country/region/ district may be generally unmastered and non-functional within particular administrative units. To the extent that the transition to the school variety (D) is unreasonably hurried, and to the extent that use of other varieties (d1, d2, d3) are cosidered contra-educational (contra-cultural, contra-integrative) at the same time that role expansion is restricted or non-existent, then obviously, an educational burden is being placed upon those least equipped to carry it and a barrier to future mobility is being erected against those least likely to scale it successfully. Such an approach to "non-standard" dialects is still common in connection with the view of Black English and Chicano Spanish held by many American school districts, as well as the veiws of non-standard French, Spanish, Russian,Hebrew and Arabic still common in the countries for which the standard (or classical) versions of these languages are the only ones administratively recognized.

In none of the above cases is the view widespread that whereas all schools should teach all students something in D and some students many things in D, there are also at least some things that should be taught to all students in d and some students most of whose education may well be in d rather than in D. The insistence on D and D only for all students for all subjects is non-functional

in many ways. It artificializes education in that it identifies it with a variety that is not functional in the life of the community. It threatens the viability of the student's primary community and of its primary networks in that it implies that only by leaving his native speech repertoire behind can the student enter a new role repertoire (and a new reward schedule). It causes education to depend upon outsiders to the community -- a veritable army of occupation and pacification on occasion -- rather than permitting it to be a partially shared function across communities or a community controlled function. It tends to impose educational content and methods and standards upon communities that are not as meaningful or as indigenous or as appealing to pupils as would be the case if the native life patterns (including the native speech) of the community were also viewed as schoolworthy.

All in all, the similarities between Type A policies when L1, L2 L3 and LWC are concerned, and Type A policies when d1, d2, d3 and D are concerned are both great and disturbing. In both cases local populations are relatively unconsulted and decisions are made for them by elites marked by broader integrative philosophies but also by self-status protective interests.

Type B policies at the inter-language level pertain to bilingual education of a somewhat more permissive sort. Type B policies hold that an internally integrative great tradition does exist at the unit level. Nevertheless, for one reason or another additional traditions too must be recognized. On the one hand, there may be smaller traditions than those that are unit-wide which have

their own place and deserve some acknowledgement in the cultural-educational sphere. On the other hand there may (also) be certain larger traditions than those that are unit-wide and these (too) may require (or demand) recognition. All in all, therefore, Type B policies obtain where administrative units do recognize an overriding and indigenous integrative principle, but yet provide for local variation under and beneath or over and above it.

Such might be considered the between-language situation in the Soviet Union (vis a vis Russian and (at least) the larger local national languages), in Mainland China (vis a vis common spoken and written Mandarin and at least larger regional languages), in Yugoslavia (vis a vis Serbian and the various larger regional languages),in the Philippines (vis a vis Tagalog and the various larger regional languages), and, perhaps, within time,in the USA (vis a vis English and the more entrenched minority languages). Certainly such policies result in a series of practical problems of their own. How many and which languages should be recognized and what should be taught in them and for how many years? The fact that bilingualism is not viewed as merely transitional in nature does not, in and of itself, provide a single answer to such questions. As indicated elsewhere, bilingual education in the monocentric context (and, therefore, normally for the minority child alone) may still be merely oral or partial rather than full (Fishman and Lovas 1970).

At the level of between-dialect policy decisions Type B policies certainly also obtain. Once again these policies have a distinct similarity to those that exist at the between language level. Once again there is one variety (D) which is viewed as having indigenous cross-unit validity. Some subjects, it is believed, should be taught in this variety everywhere and to everyone. However, in addition, and particularly in the elementary grades, there are also other subjects that may well be taught in various parts of the polity in the local d's that parents, children and school-teachers alike share as the everyday varieties of various social functions. Only in the upper grades -- in schools which are likely to be regional rather than local in nature -- is it expected that almost everything will be taugh in D, but, then, such schools are either not expected to serve everyone to begin with or, in addition, by the time students reach them, they will have had eight or more years of time to master D, at least in writing if not fully in speech.

The foregoing approaches to bidialectal education is encountered, in most parts of Germany (see Fishman and Lueders, in press), in most parts of Italy, in most parts of the Netherlands, in many parts of Norway and Great Britain, in various sections of German-Switzerland and elsehere. The burdern of acquiring and mastering D is primarily reserved for the written language and falls primarily upon those best able to handle it, namely, those with the most education and, therefore, with the expectation of the widest role-repertoire and with the best chances for real social as well as geographic mobility. Teachers (particularly elementary school teachers) and pupils are commonly members of the same speech community. The school is not viewed as

a foreign body thrust upon an unwilling local populace, but, rather, as a place in which local speech, local folklore, local history and local authenticity have their rightful place. However, the local who aspires to the wide role repertoire that is the mark and the distinction of the professional and the intellectual must also prepare to rub shoulders with peers from other localities than his own, and, therefore, he must master D, as well as d1 (or socially differentiated d1, d2, d3). All communities recognize and respect D, but all communities also feel themselves to be respected and consulted partners in the overall enterprise which D symbolizes.

Finally we come to Type C policies with respect to between-language relationships. In this connection we find that no single integrating indigenous tradition exists, but, rather, several competing great traditions each with its numerous and powerful adherents. Thus, regional differences, far from needing protection or recognition, need, instead, to be bridged or momentarily set aside if the polity is to survive. It is well recognized that pupils will be educated in their own mother tongues. The only question is whether they will also be sufficiently educated in some other tongue that they can use for communicating with fellow citizens of another mother tongue. Here bilingual education is of two kinds: sometimes in one or another of the several coequal (and often mutually sensitive) regional languages, and sometimes in an exterior LWC that may appear non-threatening to all concerned. Such

bilingual education is common in Belgium, in Canada, in Switzerland, in India. Sometimes such polities lack a real link language and, only a small bilingual elite exists to hold together their multicentricity. Switzerland is an example of how stable even such arrangements can be (although German probably functions as an overall link language more frequently than is officially recognized to be the case).

Type C polities also have their counterparts at the between-dialect level although these are few in number. Just as there are several polities with locally well entrenched languages, such that each locality must be educationally concerned with teaching a link language for communication with the other localities of the same polity, so there are (or, at least, have been) counterparts of this situation at the between-dialect educational policy level. There are, of course, also polities in which each region teaches in its own dialect without any concern at all for a link-dialect, due to the fact that the dialects themselves are of high mutual understandability and of roughly similar social standing. The United States and several Latin American countries may be said to be in this situation.

In recent years, a noteworthy Type C policy at the interdialectal level existed at the height of Norway's efforts to link Riksmal and Landsmal via a manufactured Samnorsk. However, if we go back earlier in history we can find a few more instances of this same type. These are instances from settings in which language standardization was not yet well advanced and veracular education was primarily

regional rather than national. Indeed, wherever vernacular education became well established in advance of unifying political or industrial development (Germany, Italy, Ireland) it was the unifying standard that had to fight for a place in education rather than the regional variant. Nevertheless, such cases tend to be self-liquidating in developing settings. Where a single standard becomes accepted it tends to lead to Type B policies in the bidialectal education field. Where no such standard becomes accepted bi-dialectalism in education is not a meaningful problem.

Conclusions

Generally speaking, the same theoretical model of educational policy decisions may be said to be useful for the description of bilingual as well as for bidalectal education. Indeed, use of such a model indicates that the same administrative units may well vary with respect to their policies at these two levels. Some units may be very permissive at one level but entirely non-permissive at others. Thus, some units are more permissive with respect to dialects than they are with respect to languages (e.g. German-Switzerland, Italy), whereas others are more permissive with respect to languages (e.g. India, where only standard Hindi may be taught even though there are tens of millions of speakers of regional varieties of Hindi). In addition, the use of a similar model for both kinds of variation renders more easily comparable any data pertaining to questions re degree (e.g. number of years), curricular content, etc. Once again, educational units vary widely in these respects when their bilingual and bidialectal policies are compared. Finally, the use of a single model for both levels of

analysis facilitates comparisons at differing administrative levels and may make it possible to more quickly compare not only polities with polities and districts with districts, but also to undertake simultaneous between polity and within polity studies in order to compare both of these sources of policy variations.

Bibliography

1. Fishman, Joshua A. National languages and languages of wider communication in the developing nations. Anthropological Linguistics, 1969, 11, 111-135.
2. Fishman, J.A. and Lovas, John. Bilingual education in sociolinguistic perspective. TESOL Quarterly 1970, 4, 215-222.
3. Fishman J.A. and Lueders, Erika. What has the sociology of language to say to the teacher? (On teaching the standard variety to speakers of dialectal or sociolectal varieties), in The Functions of Language, Courtney B. Cazden, Vera John and Dell Hymes eds. New York, Teachers College Press, in press.
4. Kelman, Herbert. Language as aid and barrier to involvement in the national system, in Can Language be Planned? Joan Rubin and Bjorn Jernudd, eds. Honolulu, East-West Center and University of Hawaii Press, 1971.
5. Whiteley, W.H. Language Use and Social Change. London, Oxford University Press, 1970.